

Application No.: 09/671,038
Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: EMC2-081PUS

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and reconsideration and reexamination are hereby requested.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the objection to the Drawings. The claim presented for examination is a method claim. Reference is made to MPEP 601.01(f):

It has been USPTO practice to treat an application that contains at least one process or method claim as an application for which a drawing is not necessary for an understanding of the invention under 35 U.S.C. 113 (first sentence)/

Please note that the patent application includes a flow diagram in FIG. 20 and a truth table in FIG. 19.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly point out that with the claimed method:

(1) when multiple candidates are requesting the bus, the "highest priority" requesting candidate will not be granted the bus if such candidate was the recipient of the previous address bus grant and

(2) bus arbitration includes determining whether or not one of the candidates has requested two consecutive transfers by asserting a double-access request for the bus.

It is respectfully submitted that such is not described or suggested in either Lenz et al. or Smith cited in the last Office Action.

Application No.: 09/671,038
Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2004

Attorney Docket No.: EMC2-081PUS

In the event any additional fee is required, please charge such amount to Patent and
Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 05-0889.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

Oct 17, 2004



Richard M. Sharkansky
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No.: 25,800
P. O. Box 557
Mashpee, MA 02649
Telephone: (508) 477-4311
Facsimile: (508) 477-7234

Q:\emc2\EMC2-081PUS(122001)\emc2-081pus response to oa mailed 06-17-04.doc